	Case 5:06-cv-04442-JF Document 6 Filed 05/01/07 Page 1 of 4
	**Original filed 5/1/07**
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	NOT FOR CITATION
9	
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	RICKEY LOUIS ALFORD, a.k.a. ) No. C 06-4442 JF (PR)
13	Morris Day,  ORDER OF DISMISSAL
14	Plaintiff,
15	vs.
16	DR. WINN, et al.,
17	Defendants.
18	/
19	Plaintiff, a state prisoner and frequent litigant in this Court, filed a civil rights
20	complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against several psychologists and psychiatrists
21	concerning his mental competency trial in Monterey Superior Court. Plaintiff seeks to
22	proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. On October 24, 2006, the Court
23	issued an Order to Show Cause to Plaintiff as to why the instant complaint should not be
24	dismissed without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). See Andrews v. King, 398
25	F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2005).
26	On November 28, 2006, Plaintiff filed a response to the Court's order. In his
27	response, Plaintiff does not address his prior dismissed actions, or dispute that these prior
28	cases, as set forth below, qualify as strikes under 28 U.S.C. 1915(g). Plaintiff alleges that
	Order of Dismissal P:pro-se\sj.jf\cr.06\Alford442dis

"my life has to be in danger, placed in isolation and confinement . . . racial discrimination based race." See Pl.'s Response at 1.

The plain language of the imminent danger clause in § 1915(g) indicates that imminent danger is to be assessed at the time of filing, not at the time of the alleged constitutional violations. See Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie, 239 F.3d 307, 312 (3d Cir. 2001) (en banc) (plaintiff's allegations of past acts of physical harassment were not sufficiently specific or related to support an inference of imminent danger); Medberry v. Butler, 185 F.3d 1189, 1192-93 (11th Cir. 1999) (finding no imminent danger where plaintiff had been placed in administrative segregation following physical assaults by fellow inmates and before he filed his complaint); Banos v. O'Guin, 144 F.3d 883, 885 (5th Cir. 1998) (§ 1915(g) applies on appeal at time request to proceed in forma pauperis is filed). Here, Plaintiff's allegations do not satisfy the "imminent danger" exception to 1915(g). Plaintiff fails to explain the imminency or severity of any injuries or any potential danger he faces in isolated confinement. He does not address the applicability of section 1915(g), and he has not otherwise paid the filing fee for this civil rights action.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA"), which was enacted on April 26, 1996, provides that a prisoner may not bring a civil action or appeal a civil judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 "if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

A review of the dismissal orders in Plaintiff's prior prisoner actions in this Court reveal that he has had at least three such cases dismissed on the grounds that they were frivolous, malicious, or failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See Day v. Feinstein, C 96-1796-FMS (dismissed as frivolous); Alford v. Johnson, C 05-1352 JF (PR) (dismissed for failure to state a claim); Alford v. Sony Electronic Inc., C 05-1581 JF (PR) (dismissed for failure to state a claim). In light of these dismissals, and because

## Case 5:06-cv-04442-JF Document 6 Filed 05/01/07 Page 3 of 4

Plaintiff is not under imminent danger of serious physical injury, the instant civil rights action is DISMISSED without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff may file his claims in a paid complaint in a new civil rights action. The Clerk shall terminate any pending motions and close the file. No filing fee is due.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>4/30/07</u>

JEREMY FOGEL

United States District Judge

Ī	Case 5:06-cv-04442-JF Document 6 Filed 05/01/07 Page 4 of 4
1	A copy of this ruling was mailed to the following:
2	Rickey Louis Alford
3	J-39242 CSP - Salinas Valley IV
4	Rickey Louis Alford J-39242 CSP - Salinas Valley IV P.O. Box 1060 Soledad, CA 93960-1060
5	Boredad, CIT 73700 1000
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	Order of Dismissal P:pro-se\si.if\cr.06\Alford442dis 4